

REMARKS

The applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's objections to claims 1 to 3. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner characterizes Smith's tow bar 28 such that "the direction of the tow bar is reversed to change from a towing position to a stabilizing position." In Smith, while the tow bar does face a different direction when the wheel 52 is rotated to the ground, the direction of the tow bar is not "reversed" as defined in claim 1. Claim 1 recites that in the towing position the first end portion is coupled to the frame and the second end extends forwardly of the frame; while in the stabilizing position the second end portion is coupled to the frame and the first end portion extends forwardly of the frame.

In Smith the same end remains coupled to the frame regardless of the orientation of his tow bar, and in the 'reversed' orientation the other end does not extend forwardly of the frame and cannot be used for towing. The bar in Smith serves a different purpose and operates differently from the present invention.

These distinctions were clearly recited in claim 1. Moreover, the applicant has now amended claim 1 to remove the term "whereby" and to further emphasize these distinctions. The applicant submits that these limitations distinguish the present invention over Smith, and render claims 1 to 3 allowable. Claims 4 to 23, which the examiner had indicated are allowable, remain unchanged.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Executed at Toronto, Ontario, Canada, on September 19, 2007.

ROBERT BZLL



Mark B. Eisen
Registration No. 33,088
(416) 971-7202, Ext. 242
Customer Number: 38735